in the whole history of art? Assume on the other hand that the teacher-student relationship did not exist during the Palaeolithic period and that all artist-magicians were self-taught and that a new artist-magician in presenting his works to the world declared himself at the same time to be an artist-magician. Is it not probable that those to whom such drawings were presented (in a ritualistic context) and who in a very literal sense would be (after the hunt) in a position to evaluate the effectiveness of said drawings (were they useful in the acquisition of food) regarded (after the hunt) the drawings in question from a critical perspective--the drawings of artist-magician-X are effective in supplying food they are therefore "good"/the drawings of artist-magician-Y are not effective in supplying food they are therefore "bad." Can not such hypothetical after-the-hunt observations/opinions be regarded as the first critical observations/opinions in the history of art? Can not those who uttered those observations/remarks be regarded as the first art critics (even though those observations/remarks have very little if anything to do with the intrinsic values of the drawings in question) in the whole history of art? [If in fact the first critical observations/remarks were uttered by Palaeolithic hunters/food gatherers who--having witnessed particular magical rites in which the drawings of a given teacher-trained or self-taught artist-magician prominently figured--returned empty-handed from the hunt (in which case the drawings in question were in all probability judged to be "bad") one wonders what the reaction of the artist-magician in question was to those observations/remarks. Did the artist-magician in question find himself--given the fact that his drawings had not effectively served the purpose for which they had been brought into existence--in complete agreement with the empty-handed hunters who judged his drawings to be "bad"? Did the artist-magician in question--not unlike virtually all imperfectly educated artists who have ever brought into existence a work of art that was judged to be "bad" by a critic regardless of the validity of the observations/remarks of the critic in question--find himself incapable of agreeing with his critics and declare those who had so judged his works to be ignorant buffons incapable of understanding let alone judging not only the artworks in question (which they have judged to be "bad") but also all other artworks that they might encounter?]